

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 20 are presented for consideration. The Examiner objected to the presented Claims 1 - 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Lops as the principal reference. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections to the claims as follows.

Claim 1 and Claims 11 – 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lops. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Lops teaches the use of lotion applicator having a large applicator pad for use in applying lotion to the back of a user. Most importantly, Lops, as shown and described, teaches the use of a flat applicator pad which has a dome-shaped front face and a flat rear surface upon a large rigid surface. As currently amended, in contrast to the teachings of Lops, claim 1 and claims 11 – 12 provide a paintball marker cleaning tool which has a scraper end which conforms to the internal shape of the paintball marker barrel. In this manner, the scraper may efficiently remove excess paint or other debris from the interior of the marker barrel. In contrast, the applicator of Lops inherently cannot conform to the interior of a paintball marker in the rigid flat state as shown and described. Therefore, as Lops does not and cannot show the conforming ability of Applicant's cleaning tool, Lops is inappropriate as §102 references for the amended claim 1 and the amended claims 11 – 12 as it does not show every element of the claimed invention. Thus, Lops does not show, claim, or teach the limitation requiring the scraper to conform to the internal

Appl. No. 10/659,539
Amendment dated 6/16/06

shape of the paintball marker barrel as required by Claim 1 and Claims 11 – 12. Claims 2 – 8 are dependent from Claim 1 so that they also include this limitation that makes them distinguishable over Lops. Claims 13 – 19 are dependent from Claim 12 so that they also include this limitation that makes them distinguishable over Lops. For a 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, because Lops does not teach or disclose every aspect of the claimed invention either implicitly or explicitly, the Claims 1 – 8 and Claims 11 – 19 of the present invention are patentably distinguishable over Lops. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1 – 8 and Claims 11 – 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

Claim 1 and Claim 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Young. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Young teaches the use of cleaning appliance having a large blade assembly for use in cleaning flat surfaces such as windows and floors, not circular surfaces such as paintball marker barrels. Young, Col. 1, Line 6. Most importantly, Young, as shown and described, teaches the use of a flat blade retained within a flat channel which extends perpendicularly. As currently amended, in contrast to the teachings of Young, claim 1 and claim 20 provide a paintball marker cleaning tool which has a scraper end which conforms to the internal shape of the paintball marker barrel. In this manner, the scraper may efficiently remove excess paint or other debris from the interior

Appl. No. 10/659,539
Amendment dated 6/16/06

of the marker barrel. In contrast, the applicator of Young inherently cannot conform to the interior of a paintball marker in the flat, substantially parallel state as shown and described. Therefore, as Young does not and cannot show the conforming ability of Applicant's cleaning tool, Young is inappropriate as §102 references for the amended claim 1 and the amended claim 20 as it does not show every element of the claimed invention. Thus, Young does not show, claim, or teach the limitation requiring the scraper to conform to the internal shape of the paintball marker barrel as required by Claim 1 and Claim 20. Claims 2 – 10 are dependent from Claim 1 so that they also include this limitation that makes them distinguishable over Young. For a 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Therefore, because Young does not teach or disclose every aspect of the claimed invention either implicitly or explicitly, the Claims 1 – 10 and Claim 20 of the present invention are patentably distinguishable over Young. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1 – 10 and Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be withdrawn.

The Examiner further rejected Claims 1 – 9 and Claims 11 – 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Belleau et al. in view of Lops. Claim 1 and Claims 11 - 12 have been amended to transverse this rejection. As mentioned above, Lops fails to teach the use of a scraper to conform to the internal shape of the paintball marker barrel. The combination of the pivot arm of Belleau et al. and the rigid, dome-shaped lotion applicator of Lops fail to teach a cleaning device conforming to the internal shape of the paintball marker as disclosed by Applicant. Further, the combination of the applicator end of Belleau et al. having the

Appl. No. 10/659,539
Amendment dated 6/16/06

substantially perpendicular attachment arms for the applicator pad and the dome-shaped applicator pad of Lops fail to teach Applicant's conforming cleaning device of Applicant as the attachment of Lops's applicator pad to Belleau's flat attachment arms inherently provides a cleaning tool which cannot conform to the interior shape of a paintball marker barrel. As stated previously, the claims of Applicant's invention are expressly drawn and limited to a scraper conforming to the internal shape of the paintball marker barrel. Neither the prior art cited by the Examiner nor the hypothetical combination of Belleau et al. and Lops teach the use of a scraper or cleaner conforming to the internal shape of a paintball marker barrel.

Further, it is improper to combine references without a teaching, motivation, or suggestion found in the prior art for combining the references. As noted by the substantial authority covered in MPEP § 2145, § 2143.01, and the decisions of the Federal Circuit, it is improper to use the present application as a means for suggestion for combining the prior art references. No cited references showing a motivation for a 'skill in the art' combination or any reference with a 'means of suggestion' has been cited for combining any of these patents. "Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art." MPEP § 2143.01 (*citing In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Nowhere does the Examiner particularly identify any suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine the prior art references, nor does the Examiner make specific findings concerning the identification of the relevant art, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the nature of the problem to be solved, or other findings to

Appl. No. 10/659,539
Amendment dated 6/16/06

support a proper obviousness analysis. See In Re Dembiczak, 50 U.S.P.Q. 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Because it is improper to use the present application as a means for suggestion for combining the prior art, Applicant respectfully requests claims 1 – 9 and claims 11 – 19 be allowed for issuance.

Additionally, the combination of the rigid flat attachment arms of Belleau et al. with the applicator material of Lops teaches away from the present invention of Applicant as the hypothetical combination does not produce a cleaning tool which can effectively clean the interior of a paintball marker by conforming to the interior of the barrel. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 1 – 9 and claims 11 – 19.

The Examiner further rejected Claim 1 – 9 and Claim 11 – 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lops in view of Mandigo. Claim 1 and Claims 11 - 12 have been amended to transverse this rejection. As mentioned above, Lops fails to teach the use of a scraper to conform to the internal shape of the paintball marker barrel. The combination of the flat applicator of Mandigo and the rigid, dome-shaped lotion applicator of Lops fail to teach a cleaning device conforming to the internal shape of the paintball marker as disclosed by Applicant. Further, the combination of the applicator of Mandigo having the substantially perpendicular attachment position for the applicator pad and the dome-shaped applicator pad of Lops fail to teach Applicant's conforming cleaning device of Applicant as the attachment of Lops's applicator pad to Mandigo flat attachment position inherently provides a cleaning tool which cannot conform to the interior shape of a paintball marker barrel. As stated previously, the claims of Applicant's invention are expressly drawn and limited to a scraper conforming to the

Appl. No. 10/659,539
Amendment dated 6/16/06

internal shape of the paintball marker barrel. Neither the prior art cited by the Examiner nor the hypothetical combination of Mandigo and Lops teach the use of a scraper or cleaner conforming to the internal shape of a paintball marker barrel.

Further, it is improper to combine references without a teaching, motivation, or suggestion found in the prior art for combining the references. As noted by the substantial authority covered in MPEP § 2145, § 2143.01, and the decisions of the Federal Circuit, it is improper to use the present application as a means for suggestion for combining the prior art references. No cited references showing a motivation for a ‘skill in the art’ combination or any reference with a ‘means of suggestion’ has been cited for combining any of these patents. “Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.” MPEP § 2143.01 (*citing In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Nowhere does the Examiner particularly identify any suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine the prior art references, nor does the Examiner make specific findings concerning the identification of the relevant art, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the nature of the problem to be solved, or other findings to support a proper obviousness analysis. See *In Re Dembiczak*, 50 U.S.P.Q. 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Because it is improper to use the present application as a means for suggestion for combining the prior art, Applicant respectfully requests claims 1 – 9 and claims 11 – 19 be allowed for issuance.

Additionally, the combination of the rigid flat attachment position of Mandigo with the applicator material of Lops teaches away from the present invention of Applicant as the hypothetical combination does not produce a cleaning tool which can effectively clean the interior of a paintball marker by conforming to the interior of the barrel. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 1 – 9 and claims 11 – 19.

The Examiner further rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stamm in view of Baldwin. Claim 20 has been amended to transverse this rejection. Stamm teaches the use of a gun cleaning device with a pear shaped aperture for the scraper. However, Stamm fails to teach the use of a paintball marker cleaning device having an arm with a pivot. The combination of the material of Baldwin and the scraper attachment of Stamm fail to teach a cleaning tool having a pivot arm as disclosed by Applicant. The claim of Applicant's invention are expressly drawn and limited to a cleaning tool having a pivot. Neither the prior art cited by the Examiner nor the hypothetical combination of Stamm and Baldwin teach the use of a cleaning tool with a pivoting arm.

Further, it is improper to combine references without a teaching, motivation, or suggestion found in the prior art for combining the references. As noted by the substantial authority covered in MPEP § 2145, § 2143.01, and the decisions of the Federal Circuit, it is improper to use the present application as a means for suggestion for combining the prior art references. No cited references showing a motivation for a 'skill in the art' combination or any reference with a 'means of suggestion' has been cited for combining any of these patents. "Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed

Appl. No. 10/659,539
Amendment dated 6/16/06

invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.”

MPEP § 2143.01 (*citing In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). Nowhere does the Examiner particularly identify any suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine the prior art references, nor does the Examiner make specific findings concerning the identification of the relevant art, the level of ordinary skill in the art, the nature of the problem to be solved, or other findings to support a proper obviousness analysis. See *In Re Dembicza*k, 50 U.S.P.Q. 1614, 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Because it is improper to use the present application as a means for suggestion for combining the prior art, Applicant respectfully requests claim 20 be allowed for issuance.

Additionally, the combination of the material of Baldwin with the flexible, tape-like cleaning rod of Stamm teaches away from the present invention of Applicant as the hypothetical combination does not produce a cleaning tool with a pivot. Indeed, the hypothetical combination of Stamm and Baldwin teaches the use of a cleaning tool with a winding arm rather than a pivoting arm. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claim 20.

Applicant respectfully requests a one month extension of time from May 16, 2006 to June 16, 2006. The fee for extension for response within first month of \$120.00 is enclosed with this response.

Applicant respectfully believes that this Amendment resolves all withstanding issues and earnestly solicits a telephone conference to expeditiously resolve any subsequent issues. Applicant respectfully believes that the amendments have addressed the Examiner’s issues and

Appl. No. 10/659,539
Amendment dated 6/16/06

believes the newly amended claims are ready for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Keisling Pieper & Scott, PLC
Meredith K. Lowry, Reg. No. 58,422
1 East Center Street, Suite 217
Fayetteville, AR 72701
Attorneys for Applicant
Tel: 479-251-0800
Fax: 479-251-0801